IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HENRY WATKINS,

Plaintiff,

V.

: NO. 02-CV-2881

PENNSYLVANIA BOARD OF PROBATION & PAROLE, EDWARD JONES, and MICHAEL BUKATA :

Defendants.

JURY VERDICT FORM FOR DEFENDANT PENNSYLVANIA BOARD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE AND/OR DEFENDANTS WILLIE E. JONES AND/OR MICHAEL BUKATA IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITIES

A. Disparate Treatment

| 1. | Do | you | find | that | the | plaintiff | has | proved | by | ĉ |
|----|-----|-------|----------------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|----|
| | pre | ponde | rance o | of the | evide | nce that ra | ce wa | as determ: | inati | ve |
| | in | motiv | <i>r</i> ating | defen | dants | ' decision | to | suspend | and/ | or |
| | ter | minat | e Mr. | Watkin | s? | | | | | |

| YES | | NO | |
|-----|-------------|----|--|
| | | | |

Continue to Question 2.

B. Retaliation

| 2. | preponder discrimin | rance of the natory pract | evidence that | ff has proved by he opposed a racial in protected conduction of 2000? | lly |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | Continue | to Question | 3. | | |
| 3. | preponder connection suspension | rance of the on between tons on June | e evidence th he plaintiff's 21, 2000 an | ff has proved by at there is a caus s 1993 lawsuit and he door October 5, 20 termination in Augu | sal nis 000 |
| | YES | | | NO | |
| | if you ar | nswered NO to | | proceed to question proceed to Question l. | |
| 4. | preponder connection during a | rance of the con between | e evidence th the plaintiff hearing in N | ff has proved by at there is a cause?'s protected conduction ovember 2000 and h | sal uct |
| | YES | | | NO | |

If you answered "YES" to Questions 3 and/or 4, continue to answer the remaining questions. If you answered "NO" to Question 3 and 4, continue to answer the remaining questions only if you answered "YES" to Question 1.

C. Hostile Work Environment

| 5. | Do you find that plaintiff has proved by a preponderance |
|----|---|
| | of the evidence that he was subjected to discrimination |
| | by the Board and/or Mr. Jones and/or Mr. Bukata, in their |
| | official capacities? |

| YES | NO | |
|-----|----|--|
| | | |

If you answered "YES" to Question 5, continue to question 6. If you answered "NO" to Question 1, but answered "YES" to Questions 1 or 3 or 2 and 4, continue to Questions 9 through 11.

6. Do you find that plaintiff has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the conduct was so severe or pervasive that a reasonable person of Mr. Watkins' position would find Mr. Watkins' work environment to be hostile or abusive?

| YES | NO | |
|-----|-------|--|
| | _ | |

If you answered "YES" to Question 6, continue to question 7. If you answered "NO" to Question 6, but answered "YES" to Questions 1 or 3 or 2 and 4, continue to Questions 9 through 11.

7. Do you find that plaintiff has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the Board's and/or Mr. Jones and/or Mr. Bukata's, in their official capacities, conduct was not welcomed by Mr. Watkins?

If you answered "YES" to Question 7, continue to question 8. If you answered "NO" to Question 7, but answered "YES" to Questions 1 and 3 or 2 and 4, continue to Questions 9 through 11.

| 8. | of the evidence that I hostile or abusive a | ntiff has proved by a pr he believed his work envi s a result of Mr. Jones fficial capacities, cond | ronment was and/or Mr. |
|------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| | YES | NO | |
| | 9. If you answered | to Question 8, continue "NO" to Question 8, b 1 or 3 or 2 and 4, o | ut answered |
| | D. | Damages | |
| favor of claim, or questions | plaintiff on his disp both. In other wo | ing questions only if yourate treatment claim, rds, you should only a "" to Questions 1 and/ord 8. | retaliatior nswer these |
| 9. | preponderance of the | the plaintiff has previdence that plaintif compensate for emotiona | f should be |
| | YES | NO | |
| | compensatory damages | s "YES," insert the that will reasonably notional pain and mental elow. | compensate |
| | \$ | | |

| 10. | preponderance o awarded damages | f the evidence that to compensate for a many | has proved by a plaintiff should be net loss of wages and ation, August 3, 2001 |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | YES | | NO |
| | compensatory da | amages that will re net loss of wages | ert the amount of easonably compensate and benefits in the |
| | \$ | _ | |
| | _ | to Questions 6 and nominal damages belo | 7 are "NO," insert a w. |
| | \$ | _ | |
| 11. | preponderance of | | has proved by a plaintiff is entitled defendant? |
| | YES | | NO |
| | | | he amount of future ed to in the space |
| | \$ | _ | |

| Foreperson: | |
|-------------|--|
| Dated: | |

 ${\tt F:\PBL\pa.bd.of\ prob.watkins\Pleadings\trial\verdict\ sheet\ revised-lrm.wpd}$